



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/635,373	08/09/2000	Christopher R. King	068070.0102	5513

7590 01/14/2004
Baker Botts LLP
2001 Ross Avenue
Dallas, TX 75201-2980

EXAMINER

LIN, WEN TAI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 01/14/2004

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/635,373

Applicant(s)

KING ET AL.

Examiner

Wen-Tai Lin

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-34 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. Claims 1-3, 6, 10-11, 15-16 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Greer et al.[U.S. Pat. No. 6009429].
3. Greer was cited as a prior art of record in the previous office action.
4. As to claims 1 and 6, Greer teaches the invention as claimed including: a directed web browsing system comprising a customizable director [i.e., a customizable browser], the customizable director operable to provide web browsing capabilities [Abstract; Fig.8; e.g., a browser using the bookmark for touring the web] and comprising:
 - a border portion having a forward element, a play element and a back element e.g., Back, Forward, Reload, Fig.2];
 - a display portion operable to display a first web page , the first web page having a link, the link having an associated second web page [the display portion of Fig.2, wherein the first page is the home page of a book-marked

website and the second page is another web page that is hyper-linked from the home page];

- an exclusive set of first web pages associated with the customizable director [e.g., each of Links 1-3, Fig.7 is a website linking to a first page] and wherein a user associated with the customizable director is required to retrieve at least one of the first web pages prior to retrieving a second web page distinct from the first web pages [col.5, lines 41-45; col.6, lines 8-37];
- determining whether a predetermined cycle time associated with the first web page has expired [col.5, lines 8-13]; and
- displaying a third web page in response to the expiration of the predetermined cycle time [i.e., in the dynamic mode the next page is automatically displayed according to a pre-set timer].

5. As to claim 2, Greer further teaches that the customizable director further comprises a timer module operable to determine the expiration of a cycle time associated with the first web pages and generated an indication that the cycle time has expired [Abstract].

6. As to claim 3, Greer further teaches that the customizable director further comprises a unique identifier and wherein the first web pages have an associated uniform resource locator [e.g., Direct Links 1-3, Fig.7, each forming a directed web tour].

Art Unit: 2154

7. As to claims 15-16, Greer teaches the invention as claimed including: a method for directed web browsing comprising customizing a director operable to provide web browsing capabilities [Abstract; Figs. 1-2 and 7-8; e.g., the customized browser uses a bookmark file for directed web tour], wherein customizing the director comprises:

- editing a border associated with the director [13, Fig.1; 21-24, Fig.2];
- editing a display area associated with the director [e.g., the display region of Fig.2 or the urlframe of Fig.1 can be scaled by redefining the frame size];
- adding at least one navigation element to the border [e.g., the taskframe of Fig.7 can be modified by changing the content of task.htm];
- adding at least one sponsor related element to the border , wherein the sponsor comprises a corporation [e.g., the symbol at the top-left corner of Fig.2 is an added sponsor related (i.e., Netscape) element];
- determining a first web page to present to a user associated with the director, the first web page having a link associated with a second web page [i.e., each of the direct links shown in Fig.7 is linked to a first page, which may have a second page linked from there];
- determining a cycle time associated with the first web page, the cycle time indicating the length of time the first web page is to be displayed to the user [Abstract]; and
- preventing the user from requesting a third web page distinct from the first and second web pages [i.e., as a directed web tour, the browser only shows

Art Unit: 2154

pre-determined web pages; any third page outside the designated web pages is excluded].

8. As to claims 10-11 and 32, since the features of these claims can also be found in claims 1-3 and 15-16, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1-3 and 15-16 above.

9. Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nobakht et al.[U.S. Pat. No. 6587873].

10. Nobakht was cited in the previous office action.

11. As to claim 31, Nobakht teaches a channel server [110, Fig.4] or directed web browsing comprising:

- an identifier module [720, 730, Fig.7];
- an identifier database operable to communicate with the identifier module and storing at least one identifier and a subscriber database operable to communicate with the identifier module and associating at least one of the identifiers with at least one channel [Fig.5(B)];
- a channel module operable to communicate with the identifier module and distribute content to the subscribers associated with the channels based on the channel and a distribution module operable to communicate with the

Art Unit: 2154

identifier module and retrieve content generated by a user associated with a director [Fig.6]; and

- an electronic mail module operable to communicate with the identifier module and communicate anonymous electronic mail between directors [col.8, lines 41-48; col.9, lines 52-58].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. Claims 4 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greer et al.(hereafter "Greer")[U.S. Pat. No. 6009429], as applied to claims 1-3, 6, 10-11, 15-16 and 32 above, and further in view of Nobakht et al.(hereafter "Nobakht")[U.S. Pat. No. 6587873], as applied to claim 31 above.

13. As to claim 4, Greer does not specifically teach that the border portion further comprises at least one channel button operable to select a category of content from a channel server.

However, Nobakht teaches a channel-based system server for providing a list of websites that a user may download and browse selected contents.

In view of Nobakht's teaching, it is obvious that the user of Greer's browser may include the channel server's website into one of the border buttons and make Nobakht's channel-based websites available when so requested, because Greer's bookmark is capable of organizing a set of user-selected favorite websites including the home page of a channel server].

14. As to claims 17-18, since the features of these claims can also be found in claims 1-4 and 15-16, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1-4 and 15-16 above.

15. Claims 5, 25-30 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greer et al. (hereafter "Greer") [U.S. Pat. No. 6009429], as applied to claims 1-4, 6, 10-11, 15-18 and 32 above.

16. As to claim 5, Greer does not specifically teach that the method further comprising a filter module operable to modify the second web page in response to selecting the link based on site criteria associated with the customizable director.

However, under the notion of parental control or pay-for-view in web browsing, it is well known that when an unauthorized page is attempted, the browser is redirected to an alternative page containing a warning message (i.e., linking to a "modified" second web page).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that Greer's browsing system be provided with such function, because by doing so it may give the user a forewarning message so that appropriate actions may be taken following the messages.

Art Unit: 2154

17. As to claim 25, Greer teaches substantially as claimed including those limitations disclosed in claim 1. Greer does not specifically teach providing a graphical user interface for displaying a folder, which is installed along with the graphical user interface, and an icon associated with a director so as to facilitate a user interacting with the associated director.

However, all these additional features are well known in the art. For example, a Microsoft's Internet browser can be invoked by clicking on the icon that is associated with the explorer's executable code in a file folder, wherein file folders are displayed via Microsoft's Explorer tool (a graphical user interface).

It is obvious that Greer's customized browser can also be invoked by clicking its icon from an associated file folder via a graphical file management tool, because this is how a vast majority of application programs are stored and interfaced to the users.

18. As to claims 26-30 and 34, since the features of these claims can also be found in claims 1-5, 15-18 and 25, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1-5, 15-18 and 25 above.

19. Claims 7-9, 12-14, 19-24 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greer et al.(hereafter "Greer")[U.S. Pat. No. 6009429], as applied to claims 1-6, 10-11, 15-18, 25-30, 32 and 34 above, further in view of Walker et al.(hereafter "Walker")[U.S. Pat. No. 6286001].

Art Unit: 2154

20. Walker was cited in the previous office action

21. As to claim 7, Greer does not specifically teach that the method further comprising filtering the second web page in response to the selection of the first link based on site criteria associated with the web browser.

However, Walker teaches that a browser system can be adapted to giving parent control over what websites are allowable for a child [Abstract].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Walker's parental control feature in Greer's browser, because prohibiting the minors from browsing unhealthy web pages is a common desire among the responsible parents.

22. As to claim 8, Walker further teaches that filtering the second web page comprises: comparing at least one second link associated with the second web page to at least one forbidden site associated with the site criteria; and removing second links which match at least a portion of any of the forbidden sites associated with the site criteria [710, Fig.7; col.12, lines 55-67].

23. As to claims 9 and 12, since the features of these claims can also be found in claims 6-8, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 6-8 above.

Art Unit: 2154

24. As to claims 22-24, Greer and Walker do not specifically teach measuring network performance, such as the latency, between the director (i.e., the browser) and a remote site and pass this information to a channel server.

However, measuring communication delay between two network nodes is a well-known art. Since Greer and Walker's system is targeted at remote data accessing including real-time data presentation (such as audio and video programs), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply a well-known communication delay measurement method for determining the delay between the client and the remote information source, because the channel server, which functions as a real-time data distributor, would require the delay information in order to allocate necessary network resources to satisfy the need.

25. As to claims 13-14, 19-21 and 33, since the features of these claims can also be found in claims 1-12, 15-18, 22-32 and 34, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1-12, 15-18, 22-32 and 34 above.

26. A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 (three) months and 0 days from the mail date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will result in ABANDONMENT of the application (see 35 U.S.C. 133, M.P.E.P. 710.02, 710.02(b)).

Art Unit: 2154

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wen-Tai Lin whose telephone number is (703)305-4875. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday(8:00-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (703) 305-8498. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703) 872-9306 for official communications; and

(703)746-5516 for status inquires draft communication.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-3900.

Wen-Tai Lin

January 9, 2004

Wen-Tai Lin
1/9/04